

7217/60192

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 9-13 remain in the application and claims 1 and 9 have been amended hereby. Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 9 under 35 USC 102(a), as being anticipated by Iijima et al. '983.

Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot.

Features of the present invention are that when a data processing portion of a transmission device presets an audio/video stream data transmission with one apparatus and another apparatus attempts to do the same, the other apparatus is rejected. When the other apparatus is rejected it sends a status command to the one apparatus requesting information for reporting an error message. See steps 103-108 in Fig. 7 and page 18, line 15 to page 21, line 7 of the present application, for example.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Iijima et al. '983 we see that there is no request for information from the rejected apparatus (VTR-2 in Fig. 6) to the preset apparatus (VTR-1 in Fig. 6) when the apparatus is rejected.

7217/60192

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 9, and the claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated by Iijima et al. '983.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called AAPA.

Features of the present invention are that when an audio/video stream data transmission between a first apparatus and a second apparatus is preset and a third apparatus sends a preset command to the first apparatus, the first apparatus rejects the preset command, and the third apparatus sends a status command to the second apparatus requesting identification information relating to the second apparatus for reporting an error message. See steps 103-108 in Fig. 7 and page 18, line 15 to page 21, line 7 of the present application, for example.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Iijima et al. '983 and the so-called AAPA fails to show or suggest that when the third apparatus (VTR-2 in Fig. 6) is rejected, the third apparatus sends a status command to the first apparatus (VTR-1 in Fig. 6) requesting identification information relating to the second apparatus for reporting an error message and, because there

7217/60192

are no features in the so-called AAPA that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called AAPA.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called AAPA and further in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called AAPA has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Iijima et al. '244 that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and the so-called AAPA and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of the so-called AAPA and further in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 10-12 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 has been addressed above and, for at least the same

7217/60192

reasons, claims 10-12 are submitted to be patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983.


Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Iijima et al. '983 in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Claim 13 depends from claim 9 which rejection over Iijima et al. '983 has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Iijima et al. '244 that somehow could be combined with Iijima et al. '983 and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is patentably distinct over Iijima et al. '983 in view of Iijima et al. '244.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Cooper & Dunham LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb

11

BEST AVAILABLE COPY